The Binary Sentence Construct

Saturday, September 10, 2022

My current project, digitalizing Latham's grammar works, and adding in to that work his references to Boole and Whately, both works on Logic, and also doing the audio book's of these works, is important for a number of reasons. Audio book form is for those who simply do not have the time to sit around and read, but need to exercise their mind a great deal more than the necessities of life. The least that they do is familiarize one with something they may want to spend more focused time on. Personally, it is how I read a work while working on other projects, for example, trying to get enough experience to write a factually correct grammar book. One would be surprised at how many times one can read something when they are simply reading by the ear instead of the eyes. Thus, I do the work for myself, and I share it. Even when I write practice essays, I write them over a large range, from humor to technical, from ranting to solemn, just for my own education.

Latham, Boole, and Whately just form a convenient group of individuals struggling with how to comprehend grammar, and they were at least cognizant of each other's work and referenced each other. Thus, their own personal experiences grouped them, no effort on my part to do it.

We are at the cusp point of human mental development which is signaled by the computer.

We know, as the computer demonstrates, what the Bible claims, what Plato claimed, what Arithmetic claims, Algebra and Geometry claim, what the definition of a thing claims, and what our own biology shows us; All information processing is done by binary recursion. This binary can be stated in two terms, relatives or verbs, and correlatives which are also called nouns: In arithmetic, 0 and 1, and Geometry the point and line: Limits and the material limited or formed.

We have two, and only two, concepts to master; in short, we have to master binary recursion in order to become functionally literate.

We can watch this development in the mind by the confusion exhibited when one asks, are things one or many? i.e. a noun or a verb. It is just one of the historical topics which is really spread around in the different ways the problem can be put, from Zeno's paradoxes to what appear to be serious discourses in philosophy, is a work literal or metaphorical? but the root question is always the same.

> "Further, since the ***matter*** exists, because it is ungenerated, it is a fortiori reasonable that the substance or essence, that which the matter is at any time coming to be, should exist; for if neither essence nor matter is to be, nothing will be at all, and since this is impossible there must be something besides the concrete thing, viz. the ***shape*** or ***form***.

> But again (B) if we are to suppose this, it is hard to say in which cases we are to suppose it and in which not. For evidently it is not possible to suppose it in all cases; we could not suppose that there is a house besides the particular houses.— Besides this, will the substance of all the individuals, such as of all men, be one? This is paradoxical, for all the things whose substance is one are one. But are the substances many and different? This also is unreasonable.— At the same time, how does the *matter* become each of the *individuals*, and ***how is the concrete thing these two elements***?" *Metaphysics*, by Aristotle.
>
> "(By the matter I mean, for instance, the bronze, by the shape the pattern of its form, and by the compound of these the statue, the concrete whole.)" *Metaphysics*, by Aristotle.

By the matter or relative, I mean the verb, by the shape, the pattern called form or correlative, that is noun, and by the compound of these, a thing, or concrete or intelligible, whole. In short, the definitive sentence.

> "For we make it out of brass and the sphere; we bring the form into this particular matter, and the result is a brazen sphere." *Metaphysics*, by Aristotle.
>
> "For the product will always have to be divisible, and one part must be this and another that; I mean the one must be matter and the other form." *Metaphysics*, by Aristotle.

Aristotle tried to formalize grammar, but he did not have the mentality to do it. His teacher, Plato worked on formalizing it, however, even he said he could not do it, he was however, a great deal smarter than Aristotle. The argument goes on even today, how are all systems of grammar effected by binary recursion? Today, the computer *is* doing it.

As Aristotle notes, we can name the form, or correlative, i.e. noun, and we can name the material difference, i.e. the relative, or verb. And we can combine them to name a thing. What he assumes, is that one is paying attention, we can only name nouns and verbs, which of these two do we use and how, to name their combination? The answer is, of course, obvious, but not obvious enough unless, apparently, you are smarter than what passes for human genius today. Noun = Noun + Verb, is the definitive sentence, or a unit and is what is meant by predication. Tom is a cat. Noun = noun and verb. As *Tom* is a noun, *a* is a noun, and *cat* is a verb. i.e. Tom is a unit, a thing, a denotes a unit or thing, and cat is the material difference. In short we learn from the perceptible grouping of material for the notion of the intelligible grouping. In the intelligible grouping, we group names to name a particular thing. I.e. we use it to effect binary recursion in our four grammar systems which make up our Grammar Matrix of Common Grammar, Arithmetic, Algebra and Geometry.

But what does Tom is brown, or Tom is fuzzy, mean? We have predication here too, but there is only one predicate. What does this mean? Our tripartite group above (Latham, Whately, Boole) all attempted to claim the two forms are actually different ways of saying that we have one form. None of them could see the binary. We do, as they noted, have

one word, predicate, but still, they neglected the idea that we have two distinctly different forms of equality. Equality is a verb, but it is also an operand, a behavior we must, as a grammar user, recognize and employ for understanding.

We have two concepts in binary. Apply the binary to the idea of equality, we have Arithmetic, based on the noun, and Geometric, based on the verb. The definitive sentence is Geometric, while the other form of the sentence is Arithmetic. Therefore, when we speak of predication, we have to also state which form of predicate, the Arithmetic, based on the noun, or the Geometric, based on the verb, we are speaking about and trying to teach.

These two elements of a thing, with the two types of identity, also give us the idea of the Literal, based on the noun, and the Metaphorical, based on the verb; Or again, the Universal, contains the metaphorical, and the Particular is contained by the Universal, i.e. two distinctly different sentence types: we have to do some intelligible swapping here. In simpler terms of past semanticists, the map is not the territory, nor is the territory the map, i.e. the perceptible is not the intelligible, nor is the intelligible the perceptible. Or, again, a noun is not a verb, and the verb is not a noun. We have to be aware of which is which at all times. For this, Plato constructed the dialog Parmenides and Meno, both of which recommended the use of geometry to follow how we use names.

One sees the original confusion, for example in Newton, Boole, and those who construct new grammar systems called many names, Predicate Calculus, for example, because they actually believe that grammar systems are either one or the other, i.e. literal or metaphorical, themselves. With sense, they should know this is not true, but, man is still struggling to become functionally literate. It is easier to spin yarns, than to admit that one does not have the intelligence to even comprehend what they are given.

The definitive sentence is metaphorical. The non-definitive sentence we use to group experiences of things is literal. One can call the non-definitive sentence as set builder notation, i.e. a collection of all the relative differences we have experienced relative to things, but which do not define them. The relative difference between terms is not predicable of either term.

What all this means, of course is topical in a correctly written grammar book, which we still do not have today, but, as I said, I am still working on my personal presentation of it.

Memory is important to understanding and that is why, one does digital editions of past work. Past authors may not have achieved their particular goal, however, the supporting literal work of theirs is, and will remain historically true. Therefore, one does not discard their work, but if possible build at least from the material within it which is true.

One of the greatest changes to make in the presentation of grammar is factual; we are managing memory. All past work on grammar as written is highly anthropomorphic. Words actually do things, at least in the author's mind; not one of them understood fact as stated by Plato, words, names, in of themselves, have absolutely no meaning. We have to be cognizant of what we are doing and why; we must be cognizant of our own behavior as the managers of information. Names, cannot possibly have meaning and they cannot introduce anything other than being memory addressing systems which can be factually manipulated by standards of our own behavior which has been abstracted from perception. One might need to study Aristotle a bit more.

I have to get back to work, on my projects. I do believe they will outlive me which excites a tempter tantrum of my own.